

system; faulty heart rhythm; failure of the blood to clot well; kidney stones, poor bones, and decaying teeth; loss of tissue tone and unhealthy condition of the skin; digestive disturbances and a tendency toward colitis; cataract, loss of hair, and unhealthy loss of weight; and imperfectly formed and maintained tooth enamel. The article would not supply eight vitamins and nine minerals of nutritional importance; it is not difficult or impossible to obtain sufficient vitamins and minerals from a diet of common foods; and the use of the article would not prevent or correct the diseases, abnormalities, and symptoms stated and implied in the leaflets.

The article was also alleged to be misbranded under the provisions of the law applicable to foods, as reported in notices of judgment on foods.

**DISPOSITION:** August 21, 1945. No claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered delivered to a public institution.

**1685. Misbranding of Merilla Shampoo. U. S. v. 305 Dozen Bottles of Merilla Shampoo and 500 circulars. Consent decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 16299. Sample No. 13043-H.)**

**LABEL FILED:** May 31, 1945, Middle District of Pennsylvania.

**ALLEGED SHIPMENT:** On or about May 19, 1945. This lot of goods had been shipped originally by An-Ne's Products Co., from Scranton, Pa., to the G. C. Murphy Co., Indianapolis, Ind., and was returned by the latter firm.

**PRODUCT:** 125 dozen 2-ounce bottles, 147 dozen 16-ounce bottles, and 32 dozen 32-ounce bottles of *Merilla Shampoo* and 500 circulars entitled "The Charm of Beautiful Healthy Hair," at Scranton, Pa.

The shampoo consisted essentially of soap, water, and not more than 0.3 percent of other ingredients, including plant material.

**LABEL, IN PART:** (Bottles) "Merilla Shampoo A Natural Beautifier \* \* \* Manufactured by An-Ne's Products Co. \* \* \* Scranton 10, Pa."

**NATURE OF CHARGE:** Misbranding, Section 502 (a), certain statements in the circulars were false and misleading since they represented and suggested that the article was a tonic; that it would be effective to promote hair health and to maintain a clear skin, free from eruptions and wrinkles, and that it would be effective in the prevention or treatment of dandruff, falling hair, and baldness. The article was not a tonic, and it would not be effective for the purposes claimed.

Further misbranding, Section 502 (a), certain statements on the bottle labels and in the circulars were misleading since they represented and suggested that the article was not a soap shampoo, whereas it was a soap shampoo.

**DISPOSITION:** July 2, 1945. The owner of the product having consented to the entry of a decree, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product, including the circulars, was ordered destroyed.

**1686. Misbranding of Beautician's Mange Treatment. U. S. v. 22 Bottles of Beautician's Mange Treatment, and a quantity of printed matter. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 16072. Sample No. 31212-H.)**

**LABEL FILED:** May 11, 1945, Southern District of California.

**ALLEGED SHIPMENT:** From Chicago, Ill., by the American Beauty Products Co. The bottles were shipped on or about May 2, 1945. The date of shipment of the printed matter was alleged to be unknown.

**PRODUCT:** 22 bottles of *Beautician's Mange Treatment* and 4 accompanying catalogs entitled "City Catalog No. 80" or "City Catalog No. 81," at Los Angeles, Calif. Examination showed that the product consisted essentially of mineral oil and guaiacol.

**NATURE OF CHARGE:** Misbranding, Section 502 (a), the labeling statements, (bottle label) "For the treatment of dandruff and falling hair. With vigorous massage this preparation will improve circulation in the scalp and thus aid in reducing falling and breaking of hair," and (catalog) "Falling, breaking hair can be reduced and scalp circulation improved when this preparation is used with vigorous massage for a few moments each week," were false and misleading since the article would not be effective in the treatment of dandruff or falling or breaking hair, and it would not improve the circulation in the scalp; and,

Section 502 (e), the label of the article failed to bear the common or usual name of each active ingredient.

It was also alleged that another article, *American Calcium Pantothenate*, was misbranded under the provisions of the law applicable to foods, as reported in notices of judgment on foods, No. 8295.

**DISPOSITION:** June 5, 1945. No claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

#### DRUGS FOR VETERINARY USE\*

**1687. Misbranding of Ger-Mo-Kill Wormer & Water Disinfect, Ger-Mo-Kill Sheep and Lamb Bar, and Hog Wormer and Conditioner.** U. S. v. Robert S. Cox (Ger-Mo-Kill Chemical Co.). Plea of guilty. Fine, \$300 and costs. (F. D. C. No. 15511. Sample Nos. 8499-F, 8500-F, 8619-F.)

**INFORMATION FILED:** May 25, 1945, Southern District of Iowa, against Robert S. Cox, trading as the Ger-Mo-Kill Chemical Co., Colfax, Iowa.

**ALLEGED SHIPMENT:** Between the approximate dates of October 28, 1943, and January 18, 1944, from the State of Iowa into the State of Minnesota.

**PRODUCT:** Analyses disclosed that the *Wormer & Water Disinfect* consisted essentially of naphthalene and small portions of epsom salt, copper sulfate, kamala, nicotine, 0.02 percent, formaldehyde, and creosote; that the *Sheep and Lamb Bar* consisted essentially of naphthalene and small proportions of phenothiazene, 0.56 percent, epsom salt, copper sulfate, and sodium bicarbonate; and that the *Hog Wormer and Conditioner* consisted essentially of epsom salt, copper sulfate, naphthalene, formaldehyde, and small proportions of creosote and oil of chenopodium.

**NATURE OF CHARGE:** *Wormer and Water Disinfect*, Misbranding, Section 502 (a), certain statements on the label and in accompanying circulars entitled, "The Benefits of Ger-Mo-Kill Poultry Bars" and "How to Use Ger-Mo-Kill Poultry Bars," were false and misleading since they represented and suggested that the article possessed germicidal and worm-expelling properties and was a water disinfectant; that it would be effective in the prevention in poultry of coccidiosis, roup, bronchitis, colds, and intestinal infections; that it would be effective in the removal of roundworms, capillaria, pinworms, and tapeworms; that it would be effective in maintaining health and egg production in chickens and turkeys; that it would be effective in preventing worm infestation and blackhead in turkeys and in preventing the spread of coccidiosis, colds, and bronchitis in baby chicks; and that, when administered to fowls, it would destroy worm-eggs, and when administered to baby chicks, it would be effective in preventing worms and would aid in the production of healthy and vigorous pullets. The article did not possess germicidal and worm-expelling properties; it was not a water disinfectant; and it would not be effective for the purposes represented.

*Sheep and Lamb Bar*, misbranding, Section 502 (a), certain statements on the label and in an accompanying circular entitled "Ger-Mo-Kill Sheep Bar" were false and misleading since they represented and suggested that the article possessed germicidal properties; that it would be effective in the elimination and removal of stomach and nodular worms in sheep and lambs; that it would be effective in preventing worms in sheep and lambs and in producing good and large lambs; and that it would be effective as a conditioner for ewes. The article did not possess germicidal properties, and it would not be effective for the purposes represented.

*Hog Wormer and Conditioner*, misbranding, Section 502 (a), certain statements on the label and in accompanying circulars entitled "Benefits of Ger-Mo-Kill Pig and Hog Bars" were false and misleading since they represented and suggested that the article possessed germicidal properties and would be effective as a conditioner; that it would be effective in the removal and destruction of worms in pigs and hogs and in the prevention and treatment of necro and flu in pigs and hogs; that it would be effective in preventing and treating practically all pig trouble and numerous diseases in pigs and hogs; that it would be effective as a conditioner for brood sows; and that it would aid in the production of good, large litters of healthy pigs. The article did not possess germicidal properties, and it would not be effective for the purposes represented.

\*See also No. 1665.